

1 Amended independent claim 1 recites in part "[a] user interface
2 comprising: a full scale image presented for display, the full scale image being
3 generated from a full scale video stream received from a content provider;" and "a
4 scaled image overlaid onto a portion of the full scale image for display, the scaled
5 image being a scaled representation of the full scale image and generated from a
6 compressed video stream received from the content provider, the compressed
7 video stream being a compressed version of the full scale video stream;".

8 Schein does not show or disclose that a full scale video stream is received
9 from a content provider, and that a compressed video stream is received from the
10 content provider, where the compressed video stream is a compressed version of
11 the full scale video stream, as recited in claim 1. Schein also does not show or
12 disclose that a full scale image is generated from the full scale video stream and
13 presented for display, and that a scaled image is generated from the compressed
14 video stream where the scaled image is a scaled representation of the full scale
15 image.

16 Schein describes that a program infomenu (130) is displayed over a portion
17 of a television screen (132), and that a browsing window (134) of the television
18 screen displays the program selected in the infomenu (*Schein* Figs. 5B-5C; col.10,
19 lines 38-61). However, there is no indication in the cited section of Schein that the
20 television program shown in the browsing window (134) is a scaled image of the
21 television program shown on the television screen (132), or that the television
22 program shown in the browsing window (134) is generated from a compressed
23 video stream that is a compressed version of a full scale video stream.

24 Although Schein appears to show the same television program in the
25 browsing window (134) as on the television screen (132) in Fig. 5B, Fig. 5C

1 illustrates that the television program shown in the browsing window (134) is
2 different than the television program shown on the television screen (132). There
3 is no correlation in Schein between the display on the television screen and the
4 display in the browsing window. As such, Schein does not disclose that a scaled
5 image is a scaled representation of the full scale image and generated from a
6 compressed video stream that is a compressed version of the full scale video
7 stream, as recited in claim 1.

8 What is described in the present application includes displaying graphics
9 otop (i.e., on top) a full screen which eases a "transition disruption problem"
10 when a user switches to a guide or something else needing a graphic, but the
11 graphic then disturbs the user's awareness of the full screen program. By showing
12 the scaled down version of the program, the user is provided an ability to follow a
13 current program, while minimizing the transition disruption problem, and yet
14 allows the user to use the graphics. Furthermore, the graphics do not obscure the
15 scaled down video so the viewer can follow along more easily.

16 Prior art systems, such as Schein, either just overlay the graphics on top of a
17 current show and obscure it, or the graphics are just shown with a small PIP of the
18 current show which may have the "transition disruption problem" described.

19 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Schein for at least the reasons
20 described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of
21 claim 1 be withdrawn.
22
23
24
25

1 **Amended independent claim 8** recites in part "receiving a full scale video
2 stream from a content provider;"; and "receiving a compressed video stream from
3 the content provider, the compressed video stream being a compressed version of
4 the full scale video stream;".

5 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Schein does not
6 show or disclose that a full scale video stream is received from a content provider,
7 and that a compressed video stream is also received from the content provider,
8 where the compressed video stream is a compressed version of the full scale video
9 stream, as recited in claim 8.

10 Claim 8 also recites "displaying a full scale image generated from the full
11 scale video stream;" and "overlaying a scaled image onto a portion of the full scale
12 image for display, the scaled image being a scaled representation of the full scale
13 image and generated from the compressed video stream;"

14 As presented in the argument supporting claim 1, Schein also does not show
15 or disclose a scaled image generated from the compressed video stream and being
16 a scaled representation of the full scale image, and overlaying a portion of the full
17 scale image, as recited in claim 8.

18 Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable over Schein, and Applicant respectfully
19 requests that the §102 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,466,220 to Cesana et al. (Cesana). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claims 1 and 8 are described above in response to the §102 rejection of claims 1 and 8.

Cesana describes an architecture for graphics processing, but does not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 1 and 8. As illustrated in Fig. 7 of Cesana, a single output is sent to a display 795. There is no teaching that the single output in Cesana includes "a full scale image generated from a full scale video stream" and "a scaled image generated from a compressed video stream" as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Similar to Schein (as described above) Cesana describes that a display (640) includes a background (600) and a scaled video (610) (Cesana Fig. 6; col.8, lines 9-44). However, there is no indication in the cited section of Cesana that the scaled video (610) is a scaled representation of the background (600), or that the scaled video (610) is generated from a compressed video stream that is a compressed version of a full scale video stream. As such, Cesana does not teach or suggest that a full scale image is generated from a full scale video stream and that a scaled image is generated from a compressed video stream where the scaled image is a scaled representation of the full scale image, and where the compressed video stream is a compressed version of the full scale video stream, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 8 are allowable over Cessana, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 1 and 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,455,632 to Ichihara et al. (Ichihara).

Claims 5-6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein in view of US Application Publication 2004/0117819A1 to Yu (Yu).

Claim 6 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein in view of U.S. Application Publication 2004/0117823 to Karaoguz et al. (Karaoguz). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 2-7 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1 which is allowable over Schein and Cesana for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 and §103 rejections of claim 1. Claims 2-7 are also allowable over the Schein-Ichihara, Schein-Yu, and/or Schein-Karaoguz combinations because neither of Ichihara, Yu, or Karaoguz address the deficiencies of Schein and Cesana as described above in response to the rejections of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejections should be withdrawn and claims 2-7 allowed.

Claims 9-11 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 8 which is allowable over Schein and Cesana for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 and §103 rejections of claim 8. Claims 9-11 are also allowable over the Schein-Ichihara and Schein-Yu combinations because neither Ichihara nor Yu address the deficiencies of Schein and Cesana as described above

1 in response to the rejections of claim 8. Accordingly, the §103 rejections should
2 be withdrawn and claims 9-11 allowed.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9/1/05By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera

Reg. No. 45,760

(509) 324-9256, ext. 245